

Utah Council on Victims of Crime
Council Meeting
August 24, 2007
11:30 a.m.
Beehive Room
Utah State Capitol

MINUTES

In attendance:

Reed Richards, Chair	Trish Bumgardner	Steve Schreiner
Scott Carver	Shelley Wright	Patricia Sheffield
Gary Jensen	Sharon Daurelle	Laura Blanchard
Doug McCleve	Kathy Elton	Kirk Torgensen
Virgil Sickels	JoAnn Zaharias	Cecelia Swainston
Mel Wilson	Tom Brunker	Kathy Elton
Ned Searle	Christine Watters	Heidi Nestel
Brandon Simmons		

I. DV Mediation Guidelines

Kathy Elton

- A. About two years ago, the legislature passed a new law that any contested divorce in the State has to go through mediation before continuing with the court process. This basically means that in any divorce where there are issues that the two parties are fighting about, the two parties can't just go into the judge and have the judge decide for them what is going to happen before they sit down on their own and try to resolve it through mediation. The only group that came in opposition to the bill being passed were the domestic violence advocates. Kathy had a lot of conversations with the advocates during the passage of the bill and a lot of really great work was done to bring the mediation communities and the DV communities together within the State. Shortly after the bill was passed, the Administrative Office of the Courts hosted a summit where they brought together some of the best-known family mediators in the State, as well as domestic violence experts and worked on what they believed would be the best practices for all family mediators to use when they approach a family mediation case. There are a few things that are known: Mediators never know whether a case is going to be a case where domestic violence is involved when they take it on; Kathy said that it is her belief and she tries to instill in the mediators who are on the court roster, that it is their responsibility to do some sort of an intake process with the parties to try to determine whether or not domestic violence is involved in the relationship, and if DV is involved, whether it is going to be a safe process to move them forward through mediation.

1. Mediation can be conducted in a way that is better and safer for the parties than the court process, and can have better outcomes than the court process. However, this is not always the case, and certainly is not the case if the mediator has no idea what they're dealing with when the parties walk into the room.
 - a. Kathy handed out a copy of the mediation best practices that were developed during the summit that took place shortly after the bill was passed. These guidelines include recommended training and experience for DV case mediators and an intake survey that is sent out to divorcing couples to get information on the relationship and the issues that are possibly going to be mediated.
 - b. With the passage of this bill, there is a provision that if a party feels uncomfortable or fearful and does not want to attempt mediation, they can be excused.
 - i. Kathy said that through reading the Council minutes, it appears that this is one of the problems that is occurring and mediators aren't doing a good job of allowing parties to opt out of mediation or to excuse them from the process when they are told that one of the parties is fearful. The Council should know that opting out is a possibility and it only takes a call to the Divorce Coordinator, Natalie Threlkeld (578-3976 or 1-800-620-6318), in Kathy's office to be excused; the party just needs to tell Natalie that they don't want to go through mediation because they can't be in the same room with the person, they will be excused that day and the paperwork will be sent to the court; a mediator should do the same thing. If a mediator is not allowing this to happen, Kathy should be notified so she can follow up with the mediator and take action to ensure that they aren't doing it as a practical matter, and that they know that they shouldn't be doing it.
 - ii. When this legislation was being passed, Kathy made the commitment to Stewart Ralphs and Judy Kasten Bell that if someone calls her office and says that they can't participate in the process, they don't have to prove that they have a protective order or have ever called the police, they just have to say that they don't want to do it. Kathy said that it is okay if that word gets out, but there are also a lot of people out there who don't really understand mediation and they opt out not knowing that

it could actually be a better process for them. Mediators can actually offer more security than the courtroom because at trial, the courtroom setting is very adversarial, the parties are there in the same room, there is no one making sure that the victim comes early or leaves late, no one escorting the victim to or from their car and holding the offender to ensure that the victim is out of the building and are five minutes away before the offender is allowed to leave and those are all things that can be built into the mediation process.

- iii. Protective orders must be modified for mediation. Also, if there is a protective order, there are split arrival times for the parties. For instance, the offender would arrive at 9:00 and they ensure that the offender is there, if the victim is very worried, she can call to confirm that the offender is in their office and in their sights before she enters. The victim comes in at 9:15, the mediators meet her in the hallway and take her to a room (the offender never sees her) and then a shuttle negotiation is conducted. At the end of negotiations, the victim is escorted to her car, they watch her drive away and another staff is upstairs with the offender and she is given a good five or ten minutes to drive away and then the offender is excused.
- iv. Depending on how strongly the victim is telling the Administrative Office of the Courts that they want to opt out, Natalie may ask them whether they understand what could be done for them through mediation and educate them a little bit about the process. It's not their job to convince people to go through mediation or bring more emotional harm to them by trying to explain it, but whether or not the Administrative Office of the Courts tries to educate them about the process goes on a case by case basis.
- v. What if the perpetrator is the one trying to opt out, similar to cases where the perpetrator tries to be the first one to run out and get a protective order? It is a concern that the opt out provision can be abused by both sides, but the domestic violence community was concerned and wanted that to be an option and the Administrative Office of the Courts felt that it was better to be safe than sorry, so there may be some abuse. The AOC will always err on the side of safety

vs. someone possibly taking advantage of the program or the opt-out provisions.

2. Not all mediators on the court roster, who are doing divorces, should be dealing with domestic violence cases and probably only a small fraction of them currently have the training and experience that they need to be doing domestic violence cases.
 - a. There is a special roster area on the website with a list of mediators who are experts in dealing with domestic violence cases. If the Council could inform advocates and DV victims of the availability of these trained mediators, it would be helpful.
 - b. Kathy's opinion of someone who is qualified to mediate a divorce involving domestic violence is as follows: 1. Master Mediator, which means that they must have over 300 hours serving as a mediator in domestic violence cases. 2. Complete the four hour online course offered by UDVC; 3. Take the two and a half day Live Basic training offered by UDVC; 4. Take a six to eight hour training on mediating cases involving domestic violence where they learn the skills and techniques of doing those cases (approved by the Administrative Office of the Courts); 5. Also must be willing to give a post-mediation survey to the parties where they can tell Kathy how it felt to be in the process with that mediator; 6. They also must re-qualify each year with four hours of continuing education in the area of domestic violence.
3. All that is required now are best practices, Kathy said that she hoped that the voluntary participation will grow as the community learns and basically expects them to be doing business this way, following the best practices is very different than how divorce mediation has been done in Utah for the past 10 or 15 years, and typically, there is little to no screening done when a mediator makes an appointment to do a mediation, they will just have the parties show up at a specific date and time and they will move into the mediation. Right now it's not mandatory, it's a best-practice standard, and that may be something that needs to be addressed or talked about.
 - a. In the past, in order to qualify for the court roster, people have not had to have training in domestic violence and now to qualify for the roster to be a mediator, they must have a minimum of six hours of training in domestic violence. This was implemented in April, so now anyone new coming onto the roster at least has an introduction to the issues around domestic violence and is taught the screening process of being a domestic mediator. So, it is

moving in that direction, but is not quite there yet, but the first steps are being taken.

4. Mel asked whether a court has an input when they enter an order as to whether the case involves domestic violence or not. Kathy stated that the Court very well may not have any idea whether or not domestic violence is involved. Mel also suggested that the courts possibly conduct that preliminary screening or intake process so that the court can actually order specific mediators or at least address the concerns with the appropriate party. Kathy said that method would definitely be helpful, but there are about 8,000 cases a year across the State and given the resources that are currently available, it would be absolutely impossible.
 - a. If the attorney knows, they could bring it up, but often times, their own attorneys don't know that domestic violence is involved.
 - b. It was suggested that maybe a few questions be added to the divorce statistical form so that when the form goes to the court, the judge and commissioner know that there is a problem even if the parties don't go into mediation.
 - i. During the summit, there was some discussion about this and even on the excuse form when a case is excused from mediation, it is not documented that the case was excused because of domestic violence because there was concern about having that in the court file for discovery purposes and if the opposing council got it and the perpetrator saw it and didn't believe the victim had ever disclosed, it could create a dangerous situation for the victim. Kathy is happy to bring this up again, but it seems that during the summit, there was quite a bit of discussion about that issue and not including it in the file was what the Domestic Violence Council felt was best for the victim's safety.

II. Post-Conviction Proceedings

Tom Brunker

- A. In every criminal case, there is a trial, sentencing, and then the direct appeal. Tom is the Post-Conviction Sectional Chief and the Capitol Case Coordinator, so his job starts in a death penalty case as soon as the direct appeal begins, and in all other cases, at the post-conviction level. After the direct appeal concludes, the post-conviction process begins and it runs through State court and the Federal courts; it's called Post-Conviction review, Habeus Corpus Review, and Collateral Review is actually a civil

process in which the convicted person sues the State to challenge his sentence or conviction, or both. In death penalty cases especially, that process has been dragging out for more than two decades. The closest person that Utah has to execution right now is Ronnie Lee Gardner and he has an appeal beginning in the Federal Appellate Court; it's 2007 and he murdered his victim in 1985. There is no question about guilt, there were several eyewitnesses, and there's no question about his sentence, he's violent in prison, and 22 years later there are still appeals in process.

1. The Attorney General's Office is going to go to the legislature this year with very broad-based reform that will include both legislative reform and a constitutional amendment. Tom doubts that the legislative reform will be a problem, but the constitutional amendment may be a little stickier and the AG's Office will be approaching the Council and asking the Council to support it as well as going to the victims directly and asking them to testify before the legislature. The amendment is not finished yet, but it will be available in about two to three weeks and Tom will send it to Reed for distribution. The reform actually shouldn't be very controversial because what is being asked for will provide a good balance between giving the convicted person an opportunity to raise serious constitutional issues about their conviction and sentence, but it will also help to foreclose repetitive, overly extensive review processes that are often used. Although they are the plaintiff and they are supposed to be moving the case forward, they have every incentive because the longer the process goes, the longer they get to live, and they know that the percentage of reversals at this level is very low, so they'll do everything possible to bring these cases to a halt and they've been quite successful.
2. Tom would also like to propose greater victim involvement on the post-conviction level. The victims have been appearing personally and through council at the trial court level, and it is evident that their involvement at that level has been extremely effective. Where the victim is still relatively invisible is at the appellate court level, and there have been a couple of decisions where the Utah Supreme Court has referred to what is just in that case. In one instance, the Supreme Court basically said that they were remanding a motion to withdraw a guilty plea, under an appellate rule that doesn't allow them to remand for this purpose, and no other court can remand under that rule, but they are going to remand it because they think that justice requires them to do it. The victim's daughter's response to this was, "justice for whom." The perpetrator had a place to go to raise that issue and this whole process has added about three more years to the process. The murder is 22 years old, the perpetrator evaded prosecution for seven years because they could never find her body and the process continues.

- a. Part of the reform would give victims' individually, an automatic right to file amicus briefs in the courts of appeals. These won't necessarily be hard, legal briefs, but it's a way for the victims to be heard by the appellate court so that even if they are filed pro se, the victim will have an opportunity to let the court hear how the delays have affected them.
- b. Another thing that would be helpful is if there were organizational amicus briefs filed in the appellate courts. In the case concerning a rape victims' psychological and medical records case, an attorney from Oregon, representing the National crime victims' unit, filed an amicus brief reminding the courts that there were victims whose rights were being affected, especially at the post-conviction level where everything should shift in favor of the State and victims. These briefs would help to remind the Courts that it isn't all about the convicted person and that the victims are entitled to closure.
 - i. There was an example in the Benvenuto case where the limitation statute had passed and should have been the end of him filing anything. He got a plea deal and plead guilty to aggravated murder and attempted aggravated murder and agreed to a life without parole sentence. He ended up trying to appeal his guilty plea, lost, and then five years later filed a post-conviction, claiming that he should be allowed to withdraw his plea because he had just discovered that since he was a Uruguayan citizen someone should have told him that he was able to contact the Uruguayan consulate. The State should have just been able to say that he had five years to discover this, he's given no reason why it was just discovered, he's time barred and the issue is closed. However, the Court has interpreted the interest of justice exception to mean that any claim that would have merit, no matter how far in the future, is an exception to the time bar, the AG's office had to take the time to brief the merits of the claim, etc.
- c. Tom said that he realized that this would involve funding, and didn't know whether or not the Council had looked into that or not.

- i. An amicus brief actually shouldn't be that costly. If the council was filing one brief per year, it shouldn't cost more than about \$10,000.00
- 3. There are really two different things that are being looked at here.
 - a. One is the ability for the victim to go to the appellate Court and let them know the impact the process is having on them, which may or may not include any legal arguments, but at least puts a face before the Court.
 - b. The second is the ability for someone to go before the Court and remind the Court that the victim has rights too, like the right to a speedy disposition, and the process should not continue to be dragged out, and the focus should no longer be on the perpetrator, but on the victim.
 - c. Ron pointed out that one of the concerns with the victim having the right to address the appellate court was that if they have to present a formal amicus brief that makes legal arguments, it's not really going to do the victim much good.
 - i. Another concern would be how do you open up this process at the appellate level, where there is no testimony and everything is based upon the record—how a process is opened up, that really can't be, to other extraneous information coming in. It could open up a complex issue with defendants saying that they should have a right to respond to everything that the victim says.
 - ii. Things like the victim's right to a speedy disposition could be raised at that level because it's not necessarily extraneous information, but the victims would have to understand that issues of that nature are the only things that can be raised at the appellate level. The guidelines need to be made clear so that the victims don't go into the process with an understanding that they're going to be able to do all these wonderful things that are actually impossible.
 - d. The best thing would be for the Council to get behind the statutory change this year and see what that does, because that could really make the biggest difference in the process.
- 4. The issue of being able to explain, in graphic detail, to the appellate court, what the impact has been on the victim is the objective of what the Council really wants to do. How the Council gets there is another

question because the trial courts use victim impact statements and the defendant doesn't generally respond.

- a. At the appellate level it's generally not a formal victim impact statement, but the victim is allowed to appear and address the court and the petitioner doesn't generally try to respond.
 - b. What the AG's office anticipated was giving the victim the right to file an amicus brief, which is not as constrained as the parties' briefs. If they file it pro se, they get greater latitude and the court can do with it what they want. A lot of times, what is contained in the brief will be in the record because they will have already addressed the trial court, so they won't be bringing in anything that is extraneous. Where the problem lies with victims themselves, especially when they're unrepresented is the technical legal argument that they have constitutional, statutory rights that the appellate courts should be aware of, and that's where it may help to have an organizational amicus brief.
 - i. The appellate court will not be looking at the trial record, but the district court, post-conviction record, so all of the information will already have been brought up at that level, and as such, will be eligible to be brought up again at this level. Also, the statutory and legal rights are legal arguments that an amicus can raise. The petitioner will most likely have the opportunity to respond to that.
5. Tom and Kirk are really going to need the full support of the Council on this issue because there is going to be a lot of opposition coming from the judiciary. Kirk and Tom will attend the next legislative meeting and discuss the issue further.

Action Item: Tom Brunker and Kirk Torgensen will attend the next legislative committee meeting to further discuss the issue of victim involvement in appellate proceedings.

III. Council Membership

Reed Richards

- A. **Nomination:** Steve nominated Laura Blanchard as the Victim Service Provider representative to the Council
 1. Council unanimously approved Laura Blanchard as the Victim Service Provider representative to the Council

- B. The Council still needs a victim representative and Christine will send out a request to service providers for any victims they feel may be willing to serve on the Council.

Action Item: Christine will send out a request to victim service providers for suggestions for victim representatives.

IV. District Rights Committee Training Steve Schreiner

- A. Steve conducted the training of the new District Rights Committee chairs. Basic victim rights were discussed, the creation of the victims rights, the responsibility of the committees, etc.

V. Committee Reports

A. Conference Committee Shanna Wettstein

1. The Council is probably going to have to wait one more year to hold the conference at the Capitol because the Capitol is not sure what they're going to have available until it's done, which will be too late to book the Capitol or anywhere else if need be. The Committee is looking into several other places that will be priced much lower than the Expo Center.
2. The Committee is looking at speakers to present on the subjects of school violence, empowering victims through victims rights, identity theft, the Adam Walsh Act, sexual assault, A Child Called It, elder abuse, rape and sexual assault issues, forensic interviews with disabled victims, and forensic issues involved with rape and sexual assault.
3. The Committee is also putting together the advertising.

B. Domestic Violence Sentencing Guidelines Ned Searle

1. There are two parts to the domestic violence sentencing guidelines.
 - a. One is the blue page that Ned passed out and it will assess lethality and give dangerous factors to be considered in custody release status for sentencing. This will be something that is given to the PSI writers when they are determining sentencing and they can fill it out and determine the lethality of that crime, so that when it comes time for sentencing, the judge will see the severity of the risk to the victim.

- b. The second part will address domestic violence courts/justice courts and rural courts, and Marlesse Whittington has agreed to help with this portion.
 - i. Many times, the offender is given probation or fines, etc. and it is the third or fourth time that they've committed the same offense. The goal now is to come up with a moniker or something that will address these issues in the domestic violence courts with crimes that come up often.
- 2. The Legislative Committee will list this issue on their agenda and decide whether or not they want to address it.

ACTION ITEM: The Legislative Committee will put the domestic violence sentencing guidelines on their issue and decide whether or not they want to address it this year.

C. Crisis Response Team

Cecelia Swainston

- 1. Cecelia is hoping to have the first steering committee meeting in October. She is interested in the Los Angeles team and their concept. Cecelia is looking into a lot of different models and funding methods for the team.

ACTION ITEM: Cecelia will be holding the first crisis response steering committee meeting in October and will be in contact with Committee members to let them know when that will be taking place.

D. Centralization of Victim Services

- 1. Reed has not yet set the first meeting, there were several contacts he wanted to make one on one and has made some of them, but is still trying to contact a few others. Reed hopes to have the first meeting set up in September.
 - a. Kirk mentioned that he would like to be included in a discussion about including the CJC's in the central victim services.

E. Legislative

1. DNA for Class B Misdemeanors

Doug McCleve

- a. Doug has met with Jay Henry and money is probably the biggest issue. Currently, the crime lab receives about 850 DNA samples per month. The Federal money that they receive is about to run out.

With the Federal money, they outsource the DNA testing to vendor labs that have to bid on it because they're not currently able to process all of them in house right now. The funding comes from the \$100.00 that the offenders have to pay and that is broken down between agencies. The problem is that many of the offenders don't have money and what's left goes to DOC, JJS, and DPS. Jay stated that the lab could probably handle 50-100 more samples per month. Depending on how creative law enforcement gets with tying Class B misdemeanors into domestic violence cases, it could create a significant number of samples.

- b. The Council needs to look at which Class B's and how many more samples that would add.
 - i. Could possibly take out some of the non-violent Class A's and add the Class B's since what the Council is really looking for is DNA samples from violent offenders.
- c. When the federal money is gone, there will be thousands of samples sitting on the shelf not being processed and this will just add to it.
- d. As long as the federal government is continuing to pay for the testing, maybe as many samples as possible should be sent through.
 - i. The problem is that there is a selection process by the federal government and they assess the states with the greatest need and it's tough to get on that list.
 - ii. Jay indicated that the federal money is probably going to run out very soon and also mentioned that the money received from offenders barely covers everything up to the testing and doesn't even cover the DNA testing.
 - iii. The State may pay if the Federal money runs out, but they've basically said at this point that they don't see any point in using State money if the Federal government is still paying.
- e. Doug will contact the courts and try to find out about Class B's and report back to the legislative committee.

ACTION ITEM: Doug will contact the courts and try to get Class B information to report back to the Legislative Committee.

2. Dating Violence

Ned Searle

- a. They are still moving forward with dating violence and deciding whether they're going to go through the Senate and who the sponsor will be.
- b. The CCJJ intern looked into 15 states that were similar to Utah and asked whether there was any information about teenage girls filing unnecessary protective orders and they don't have any of that information.

3. Correction to Expungement Statute

James Swink

- a. Due to James' absence, this issue will be tabled until the next meeting.

4. Restitution

Mel Wilson

- a. Mel attended a meeting with a committee consisting of representatives from the Attorney General's Office and the State Office of Debt Collection, and Mel received a letter on the 20th indicating that CCJJ had voted to create an ad hoc committee and Mel has been invited to attend their first meeting. At the last meeting, the committee looked at the process of collecting restitution and procedures that are currently in place, and the primary function of this ad hoc committee will probably be to study that and then make a recommendation through the legislative process.

5. Son of Sam Laws (Laws prohibiting an offender from profiting through media, publications, etc.)

- a. Mel does not yet have anything to report on this issue.

6. Legal Clinic

Reed Richards

- a. Need to figure out what to do when the money runs out and it's probably not a good idea to actually wait until the money runs out and then try to get more money. If the Clinic is going to seek legislative money, this would probably be the year to go to the legislature for that.
 - i. If the Victims' Rights legislation proposed by the Attorney General's Office can get the legislature in the mode of thinking that the cases are taking way too long and the amount of time needs to be reduced, it could also be proposed that one way to reduce that amount of time would be to fund the victims' clinic to do post-conviction work.

- ii. If a fiscal note is added to the bill from the Attorney General's Office, it may cause problems for the original bill itself.
- b. At the end of June, the Legal Clinic found out that the Office on Victims of Crime was opening up an RFP for up to \$200,000.00 for any particular program making an application. The National Crime Victim Law Institute applied for all \$2 million with the understanding that if they were awarded the money, Utah would automatically be qualified for \$200,000.00 of that money. The NCVLI should be finding out at the beginning of October whether or not they will be awarded the money.
 - i. The NCVLI money would be one-time funding, but if the Clinic could secure \$50,000.00 from the legislature, it work out pretty well.
 - ii. The Federal money that is allocated is very nice, but it has to be budgeted very specifically and the Clinic can't deviate from that budget, so it would be nice if the Clinic could get some other discretionary money somewhere.
 - iii. The budget does not have to be completely dedicated to Federal cases; State cases can be taken on as well.
- c. This issue will be tabled for further discussion at the next Legislative Committee meeting.

7. Adam Walsh

Sharon Daurelle

- a. Mike Haddon and Debbie Ogden from DOC just attended a week-long training on the Adam Walsh act and Sharon can ask them to come present the information they received.
- b. The juvenile issues within Adam Walsh are the issues that are controversial right now, because Adam Walsh mandates that juvenile sex offenders be registered on the sex offender registry and left on for 15 years to life. The question is whether or not to get behind this, but on the other hand, there are BURN grant funds attached to some of the provisions so it creates somewhat of an issue.
 - i. Brett Parkinson, U.S. Attorney was involved in writing the Adam Walsh law and would be happy to come present the information to the council. Cecelia will ask him to come and talk to the council about the juvenile provisions of Adam Walsh.

ACTION ITEM: Cecelia will ask Brett Parkinson to come speak to the Council about the juvenile provisions of Adam Walsh.

- c. Judge Yeates is also well-versed in Adam Walsh and would be able to add to the discussion.
- d. The issue will be tabled and discussed further at the Legislative Committee meeting.
- 8. Sexual Assault Privileged Communication Brent Berkley
 - a. This issue will be deferred to the Legislative Committee because it has not yet been discussed with UDVC.
- 9. Defining a Victim under Title 17 to Include James Swink
Victims of Misdemeanor Crimes
 - a. Due to James' absence, this issue will be tabled until the Legislative Committee meeting
- 10. Intern
 - a. Need to put out a request and do some interviews for interns. Christine will get that taken care of.

ACTION ITEM: Christine will put out a request for a legislative intern.

VI. VINE

- A. Tabled for next meeting

VII. VAWA Certifications

Ron Gordon

- A. The certification that has been the most problematic so far is the certification that requires judges to inform misdemeanor domestic violence offenders of firearm restrictions. Ron has drafted a letter and sent it to the AOC and it looks like the Supreme Court is now going to draft a change to court rules that would require courts, district and justice, to conform to the misdemeanor federal weapons restrictions. This has to be done by January so it has been taken to a management committee, the Chief Justice is on the management committee and she was receptive and responsive and will probably be able to get everyone else on board.

VIII. Other Items

A. Ron may have another item for the Legislative Committee to look into. He was contacted by West Valley City and they have received VAWA funding to encourage arrest on protective order violations and there is a new condition that they have to certify to that says that at the request of the victim, the government will administer to the perpetrator of an alleged sex offense, an STD test within 48 hours. There is already a similar statute in place, but it says that the STD test happens upon conviction, but according to this new certification, the test would have to be administered within 48 hours. If this is going to happen, it would have to be legislatively and right now it's an issue for one jurisdiction in Utah, but Ron isn't sure how many other jurisdictions in Utah will be affected by this. The certification has to be done by January 5, 2008 or the end of the next legislative session.

IX. Next Meeting: The next Council meeting will be held on Friday, October 26, 2007 in the Seagull Room at the Capitol at 11:30 a.m.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. **ACTION ITEM:** Tom Brunker and Kirk Torgensen will attend the next legislative committee meeting to further discuss the issue of victim involvement in appellate proceedings.
2. **ACTION ITEM:** Christine will send out a request to victim service providers for suggestions for victim representatives.
3. **ACTION ITEM:** The Legislative Committee will put the domestic violence sentencing guidelines on their issue and decide whether or not they want to address it this year.
4. **ACTION ITEM:** Cecelia will be holding the first crisis response steering committee meeting in October and will be in contact with Committee members to let them know when that will be taking place.
5. **ACTION ITEM:** Doug will contact the courts and try to get Class B information to report back to the Legislative Committee.
6. **ACTION ITEM:** Cecelia will ask Brett Parkinson to come speak to the Council about the juvenile provisions of Adam Walsh.
7. **ACTION ITEM:** Christine will put out a request for a legislative intern.